

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address of MMI St. Nich of Pracents And Trademanders were reported by 2001

DATE MAILED: 12.23/2002

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ALTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO	
09.631,638	08/02/2000	Kevin M. Moore	[533 0980001 SRL PAJ	8662	
2011)	590 12 23 2002				
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC			EXAMINER		
	ORK AVENUE, N.W., SU N, DC - 20005-3934	AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 600 DC 20005-3934		NAFF, DAVID M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1651		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington D.C. 20231

14/67/674 8/2/00 NADIR

1533.0980001/50K

## Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

#### **ADVISORY ACTION**

ДТН	THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:					
a)	is extended to run or continues to run from the date	e of the final rejection				
b)	expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.					
	Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1 136(a), the propose The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the repurposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. An 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for respon	esponse and also the date for the my extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR				
☐ Ap	Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).					
Ap to	Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed	following effect, but it is not deemed				
1.	The proposed amendments to the claim and /or specification will not be entered and the final r	ejection stands because:				
	<ul> <li>There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment in presented.</li> </ul>	s necessary and was not earlier				
	b. They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Not	е).				
	c. They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).					
	d They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially recappeal.	ducing or simplifying the issues for				
	e.   They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
	NOTE:					
2.	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowed if submitted in a s the non-allowable claims.	eparately filed amendment cancelling				
з. 🏋	Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment will be entered will not be entered be as follows:	ed and the status of the claims will				
	Claims allowed. Mane					
	Claims allowed.  Claims objected to  Claims rejected: 1-7 + 9-31					
	Olalina rejected.					
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s).	ivist and second				
٥	p paragraph rejections					
4 74	However,  Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s).  YSUSCIIZ F  Javagraph Rejections  The affidaxt exhibitor request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcon  After him of the consideration has been considered but does not overcon	ne the rejection because 772				
5	The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and suffice presented.	cent reasons why it was not learlier				
[] The	The proposed drawing correction has has not been approved by the examiner	- 11				
□ Other						
		AVID M NAFF				

PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART LINIT 1255

Application Number: 09/631,638 Page 2

Art Unit: 1651

15

### ATTACHMENT OT FORM PTOL-303

The rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumpelmann et al (5,852,211) in view of Bott et al (0 174 624) is maintained.

Applicants urge that Dumpelmann et al does not disclose drying the fermentation broth and reaction of the dried product with a lower alcohol and acid as claimed. However, when Bott et al is consider, it would have been obvious to omit crystallizing of NaKGA in the broth of Dumpelmann et al, and simply dry the broth and mix the dried broth with the lower alcohol and acid to simplify.

Applicants refer to col 3, lines 26-31, of Dumpelmann et al as disclosing that crystallization or drying of KGA should be avoided.

However, this relates to drying KGA isolated from a fermentation broth by crystallizing, not to drying of a fermentation containing KGA as suggested Bott et al.

It is recognized as urged by applicants that Bott et al does not remove insolubles after reacting the organic acid-containing product with alcohol in the presence of an acid. However, Bott et al does not remove insolubles because insolubles are not formed. When insolubles are formed as disclosed by Dumpelmann et al, it would have been obvious to remove the insolubles as disclosed by Dumpelmann et al.

Contrary to applicants' argument, the teachings of Dumpelmann et al of not crystallization or drying of KGA as in the prior art do not contradict the teachings of Bott et al since Bott et al is not crystallizing or drying crystallized KGA, but instead is drying a

Application Number: 09/631,638 Page 3

Art Unit: 1651

fermentation broth containing an organic acid, and then reacting the dried broth with a lower alcohol and acid. There is seen no convincing reason why the steps of Bott et al cannot be used when the organic acid is KGA. Drying a fermentation broth containing KGA is not drying KGA isolated from a broth which Dumpelmann et al indicate is disadvantageous.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M. Naff whose telephone number is (703) 308-0520. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from about 8:30 AM to about 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, a message can be left on voice mail.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn, can be reached at telephone number (703) 308-4743.

The fax phone number is (703) 872-9306 before final rejection or (703) 872-9307 after final rejection.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

DAVID M. NAFF
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT \$25.00

10

DMN